

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

KARI SUKICH,

Plaintiff,

Hon. Ellen S. Carmody

v.

Case No. 1:14-CV-1136

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant.

OPINION

This is an action pursuant to Section 205(g) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), to review a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying Plaintiff's claim for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. On January 20, 2015, the parties agreed to proceed in this Court for all further proceedings, including an order of final judgment. (Dkt. #10).

Section 405(g) limits the Court to a review of the administrative record and provides that if the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence it shall be conclusive. The Commissioner has found that Plaintiff is not disabled within the meaning of the Act. For the reasons stated below, the Court concludes that the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence. Accordingly, the Commissioner's decision is **affirmed**.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Court's jurisdiction is confined to a review of the Commissioner's decision and of the record made in the administrative hearing process. *See Willbanks v. Sec'y of Health and Human Services*, 847 F.2d 301, 303 (6th Cir. 1988). The scope of judicial review in a social security case is limited to determining whether the Commissioner applied the proper legal standards in making her decision and whether there exists in the record substantial evidence supporting that decision. *See Brainard v. Sec'y of Health and Human Services*, 889 F.2d 679, 681 (6th Cir. 1989).

The Court may not conduct a de novo review of the case, resolve evidentiary conflicts, or decide questions of credibility. *See Garner v. Heckler*, 745 F.2d 383, 387 (6th Cir. 1984). It is the Commissioner who is charged with finding the facts relevant to an application for disability benefits, and her findings are conclusive provided they are supported by substantial evidence. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). Substantial evidence is more than a scintilla, but less than a preponderance. *See Cohen v. Sec'y of Dep't of Health and Human Services*, 964 F.2d 524, 528 (6th Cir. 1992) (citations omitted). It is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *See Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971); *Bogle v. Sullivan*, 998 F.2d 342, 347 (6th Cir. 1993). In determining the substantiality of the evidence, the Court must consider the evidence on the record as a whole and take into account whatever in the record fairly detracts from its weight. *See Richardson v. Sec'y of Health and Human Services*, 735 F.2d 962, 963 (6th Cir. 1984).

As has been widely recognized, the substantial evidence standard presupposes the existence of a zone within which the decision maker can properly rule either way, without judicial interference. *See Mullen v. Bowen*, 800 F.2d 535, 545 (6th Cir. 1986) (citation omitted). This

standard affords to the administrative decision maker considerable latitude, and indicates that a decision supported by substantial evidence will not be reversed simply because the evidence would have supported a contrary decision. *See Bogle*, 998 F.2d at 347; *Mullen*, 800 F.2d at 545.

PROCEDURAL POSTURE

Plaintiff was 41 years of age on her alleged disability onset date. (Tr. 122). She successfully completed high school and worked previously as a waitress. (Tr. 59, 147). Plaintiff applied for benefits on July 19, 2012, alleging that she had been disabled since January 7, 2011, due to degenerative disc disease and arthritis of the neck and back. (Tr. 122-27, 146). Plaintiff's application was denied, after which time she requested a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). (Tr. 64-121). On May 10, 2013, Plaintiff appeared before ALJ Henry Kramzyk with testimony being offered by Plaintiff and a vocational expert. (Tr. 33-63). In a written decision dated June 14, 2013, the ALJ determined that Plaintiff was not disabled. (Tr. 21-29). The Appeals Council declined to review the ALJ's determination, rendering it the Commissioner's final decision in the matter. (Tr. 1-5). Plaintiff subsequently initiated this pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of the ALJ's decision.

ANALYSIS OF THE ALJ'S DECISION

The social security regulations articulate a five-step sequential process for evaluating disability. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520(a-f), 416.920(a-f).¹ If the Commissioner can make a

¹1. An individual who is working and engaging in substantial gainful activity will not be found to be "disabled" regardless of medical findings (20 C.F.R. 404.1520(b));

2. An individual who does not have a "severe impairment" will not be found "disabled" (20 C.F.R. 404.1520(c));

dispositive finding at any point in the review, no further finding is required. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520(a), 416.920(a). The regulations also provide that if a claimant suffers from a nonexertional impairment as well as an exertional impairment, both are considered in determining her residual functional capacity. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1545, 416.945.

The burden of establishing the right to benefits rests squarely on Plaintiff's shoulders, and she can satisfy her burden by demonstrating that her impairments are so severe that she is unable to perform her previous work, and cannot, considering her age, education, and work experience, perform any other substantial gainful employment existing in significant numbers in the national economy. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(2)(A); *Cohen*, 964 F.2d at 528. While the burden of proof shifts to the Commissioner at step five of the sequential evaluation process, Plaintiff bears the burden of proof through step four of the procedure, the point at which her residual functioning capacity (RFC) is determined. *See Bowen v. Yuckert*, 482 U.S. 137, 146 n.5 (1987); *Walters v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 127 F.3d 525, 528 (6th Cir. 1997) (ALJ determines RFC at step four, at which point claimant bears the burden of proof).

The ALJ determined that Plaintiff suffers from: (1) degenerative disc disease of the cervical and lumbar spine; and (2) bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome, severe impairments that whether considered alone or in combination with other impairments, failed to satisfy the requirements of any

-
3. If an individual is not working and is suffering from a severe impairment which meets the duration requirement and which "meets or equals" a listed impairment in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of Regulations No. 4, a finding of "disabled" will be made without consideration of vocational factors (20 C.F.R. 404.1520(d));
 4. If an individual is capable of performing work he or she has done in the past, a finding of "not disabled" must be made (20 C.F.R. 404.1520(e));
 5. If an individual's impairment is so severe as to preclude the performance of past work, other factors including age, education, past work experience, and residual functional capacity must be considered to determine if other work can be performed (20 C.F.R. 404.1520(f)).

impairment identified in the Listing of Impairments detailed in 20 C.F.R., Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1. (Tr. 23-24). With respect to Plaintiff's residual functional capacity, the ALJ found that Plaintiff retained the ability to perform work subject to the following limitations: (1) she can lift, carry, push, and pull 20 pounds occasionally and 10 pounds frequently; (2) she can sit for 6 hours and stand/walk for 6 hours daily; (3) she can never climb ladders, ropes, or scaffolds, but can occasionally climb ramps and stairs; (4) she can occasionally balance, stoop, crouch, kneel, and crawl; (5) she can frequently use both hands for fine and gross manipulation; and (6) she must avoid concentrated exposure to hazards such as dangerous machinery or unprotected heights. (Tr. 24).

The ALJ determined that Plaintiff could not perform her past relevant work, at which point the burden of proof shifted to the Commissioner to establish by substantial evidence that a significant number of jobs exist in the national economy which Plaintiff could perform, her limitations notwithstanding. *See Richardson*, 735 F.2d at 964. While the ALJ is not required to question a vocational expert on this issue, "a finding supported by substantial evidence that a claimant has the vocational qualifications to perform specific jobs" is needed to meet the burden. *O'Banner v. Sec'y of Health and Human Services*, 587 F.2d 321, 323 (6th Cir. 1978) (emphasis added). This standard requires more than mere intuition or conjecture by the ALJ that the claimant can perform specific jobs in the national economy. *See Richardson*, 735 F.2d at 964. Accordingly, ALJs routinely question vocational experts in an attempt to determine whether there exist a significant number of jobs which a particular claimant can perform, her limitations notwithstanding.

The vocational expert testified that there existed approximately 7,110 jobs in the state of Michigan which an individual with Plaintiff's RFC could perform, such limitations notwithstanding. (Tr. 57-62). This represents a significant number of jobs. *See Born v. Sec'y of*

Health and Human Services, 923 F.2d 1168, 1174 (6th Cir. 1990); *Hall v. Bowen*, 837 F.2d 272, 274 (6th Cir. 1988); *Martin v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 170 Fed. Appx. 369, 374 (6th Cir., Mar. 1, 2006). Accordingly, the ALJ concluded that Plaintiff was not entitled to disability benefits.

I. Section 1.04 of the Listing of Impairments

The Listing of Impairments, detailed in 20 C.F.R., Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1, identifies various impairments which, if present to the severity detailed therein, result in a finding that the claimant is disabled. Plaintiff asserts that she is entitled to relief because she satisfies the requirements of Section 1.04 of the Listing of Impairments.

Section 1.00 of the Listing addresses disorders of the musculoskeletal system, including those resulting from “degenerative processes, traumatic or developmental events.” 20 C.F.R., Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1, § 1.00. Plaintiff asserts that she satisfies Section 1.04(A) which provides as follows:

Disorders of the spine (e.g., herniated nucleus pulposus, spinal arachnoiditis, spinal stenosis, osteoarthritis, degenerative disc disease, facet arthritis, vertebral fracture) resulting in compromise of a nerve root. . .or the spinal cord.

[Combined w]ith:

- A. Evidence of nerve root compression characterized by neuro-anatomic distribution of pain, limitation of motion of the spine, motor loss (atrophy with associated muscle weakness or muscle weakness) accompanied by sensory or reflex loss and, if there is involvement of the lower back, positive straight-leg raising test (sitting and supine).

20 C.F.R., Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1, § 1.04.

X-rays of Plaintiff's cervical spine, taken December 29, 2010, revealed "mild" disc space narrowing at C6-7. (Tr. 207). The results of a June 22, 2011 EMG examination were "completely normal." (Tr. 179-80). X-rays of Plaintiff's lumbar spine, taken July 19, 2011, were "normal." (Tr. 201). Treatment notes dated March 1, 2012, through May 31, 2012, indicate that Plaintiff's back pain was "controlled" with medication. (Tr. 245, 270, 278).

A September 1, 2012 MRI of Plaintiff's cervical spine revealed a "C5-C6 disc protrusion with mild spinal stenosis." (Tr. 241). A September 20, 2012 examination of Plaintiff's back revealed no evidence of spasm or tenderness. (Tr. 286). Plaintiff exhibited "full" range of motion with no evidence of weakness, sensory impairment, or diminished reflexes. (Tr. 286). Straight leg raising was also negative. (Tr. 286). A January 15, 2013 examination of Plaintiff's back revealed "full" range of motion with no evidence of spasm or tenderness. (Tr. 283). Straight "leg raising was negative and her motor, sensory, and reflex exams were normal." (Tr. 283). A May 18, 2013 MRI of Plaintiff's lumbar spine revealed "mild" disc bulging and "mild" degenerative changes. (Tr. 307).

The evidence reveals that while Plaintiff suffers a severe spinal impairment, such does not satisfy the requirements of the Listing in question. The burden rests with Plaintiff to demonstrate that she satisfies the requirements of a listed impairment. *See Kirby v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 2002 WL 1315617 at *1 (6th Cir., June 14, 2002). The ALJ evaluated the evidence of record and determined that Plaintiff failed to meet her burden. The ALJ's decision in this regard is supported by substantial evidence.

In a related argument, Plaintiff argues that she is entitled to relief because the ALJ failed to consult a medical expert on the issue whether she satisfied the Listing in question. It is

Plaintiff's responsibility to provide the evidence necessary to evaluate her claim for benefits. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 416.912. As the Supreme Court has observed, "[i]t is not unreasonable to require the claimant, who is in a better position to provide information about his own medical condition, to do so." *Yuckert*, 482 U.S. at 146 n.5.

Only under "special circumstances, i.e., when a claimant is without counsel, is not capable of presenting an effective case, *and* is unfamiliar with hearing procedures, does an ALJ have a special, heightened duty to develop the record." *Trandafir v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 58 Fed. Appx. 113, 115 (6th Cir., Jan. 31, 2003) (emphasis added) (citations omitted); *Nabours v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 50 Fed. Appx. 272, 275 (6th Cir., Nov. 4, 2002) (citations omitted). Plaintiff was represented at the administrative hearing and there is no evidence that her counsel was incapable of advocating Plaintiff's position or was unfamiliar with the relevant hearing procedures. Thus, the Court finds that the ALJ was not under a heightened duty to develop the record in this matter.

The ALJ is not required to supplement the record with additional evidence unless the record as it then exists is insufficient to assess Plaintiff's residual functional capacity or otherwise resolve his claims. *See, e.g., Lamb v. Barnhart*, 85 Fed. Appx. 52, 57 (10th Cir., Dec. 11, 2003); *Ruby v. Colvin*, 2014 WL 5782930 at *13 (S.D. Ohio, Nov. 6, 2014); *Haney v. Astrue*, 2010 WL 3859778 at *3 (E.D. Okla., Sept. 15, 2010); *Brown v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 709 F.Supp.2d 248, 257 (S.D.N.Y. 2010); *Allison*, 2000 WL 1276950 at *5. Because the record was sufficient to resolve Plaintiff's claim that she suffered from a listed impairment, this argument is rejected.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons articulated herein, the Court concludes that the ALJ's decision is supported by substantial evidence. Accordingly, the Commissioner's decision is **affirmed**. The Court further determines that appeal of this matter would not be taken in good faith. *See Smith v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 1999 WL 1336109 at *2 (6th Cir., Dec. 20, 1999); *Leal v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 2015 WL 731311 at *2 (N.D. Ohio, Feb. 19, 2015); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). A judgment consistent with this opinion will enter.

Date: October 20, 2015

/s/ Ellen S. Carmody
ELLEN S. CARMODY
United States Magistrate Judge